	Case 2:10-cv-00321-JCM-GWF Document 24 Filed 09/14/10 Page 1 of 2
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6	DISTRICT OF NEVADA
7	RONALD G. ROBINSON and SHIRLEY E. ROBINSON, 2:10-CV-321 JCM (PAL)
8	Plaintiffs,
9	Plaintills,
10	v.
11	OCWEN LOAN SERVICING, LLC, et
12	al.,
13	Defendants.
14	
15	ORDER
16	Presently before the court are plaintiffs' motion for district judge to reconsider order on
17	motion to amend/correct complaint (doc. #20) and motion for district judge to reconsider order on
18	motion to dismiss (doc. #21). Defendants responded (doc. #22 & 23, respectively); plaintiffs have
19	not replied.
20	This court granted defendants' motion to dismiss without prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule
21	of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) on July 16, 2010, for failure to state a claim upon which relief could be
22	granted. (Doc. #17). Plaintiffs subsequently requested leave to amend their complaint (doc. #12),
23	which this court denied for failure to attach a proposed amended complaint as required by Local Rule
24	15-1 (doc. #16). Plaintiffs then filed the instant motions for reconsideration of their motion to amend
25	(doc. #20) and for reconsideration of the order granting defendants' motion to dismiss (doc. #21).
26	
27	
28	
James C. Mahan U.S. District Judge	

I. Motion to Amend/Correct Complaint (doc. #20) When this court dismissed the original complaint, it did not dismiss the action. Loux v. Rhay,

375 F.2d 55, 57 (9th Cir. 1967). The July 16, 2010, order granted defendants' motion to dismiss "without prejudice" (doc. #17). Now that plaintiffs have complied with the local rule and have attached a proposed pleading (doc. #20-2), the court finds it unjust to deny plaintiffs leave to file their amended complaint. Thus, the motion to reconsider the order on the motion to amend/correct complaint (doc. #20) is granted. Plaintiffs may file their amended pleading.

II. Motion to Reconsider Order on Motion to Dismiss (doc. #21)

Once filed and properly served, the amended complaint supersedes the original, and the plaintiffs waive any errors in the ruling on their original complaints. *Lauderdale v. County of Alameda*, 911 F.2d 738 (9th Cir. 1990). Thus, the court need not reconsider its ruling on the motion to dismiss the original complaint.

IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that plaintiffs' motion for district judge to reconsider order on motion to amend/correct complaint (doc. #20) is hereby GRANTED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiffs' motion for district judge to reconsider order on motion to dismiss (doc. #21) is hereby DENIED.

DATED September 14, 2010.

James C. Mahan U.S. District Judge UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Elle C. Mahan